

1-15-12

DMs

Type II det (FS-only) (+FC-only)
is feasible before stable Type I

Plans, soft margins (+ S-orange)
come before submissions

Then, when subs come, plans + margins
don't go (to D-L, FS remains) remains
despite + counter to subs;
despite illusory nature

Initial Type I det - here cap - is very
unstable (if 2-sided) (esp. if roughly
equal)

if subs can print ...

process would not be
unstable: one side not
unstable, explained

1. US wants Type II, can + does get it.
(but too small initially to
stop invasion)
2. SU builds unstable Type I - spurs US Type II/FS
3. US claims to plan: SU conventional force sup.
SU FS cap. (disaggregated) (exaggerated)
builds large FS cap. (D.M.)
4. Berlin + Cuba - it - influence of US "sup."

1-15-12

5. SA mts are to imitate:

By organizing the force ~~in~~ 1968
we expected the force of 1960-62;
the force we planned — (the DM!)
this spurs us to build ^{still} larger force: MTRV
deep...

→ ² DMS on Air-triggers,
and Dual Hand, delay

(an DM evokes this DM, both on bin-type this (real) DM evokes an DM

Our ^{USAF} response in 1967-68-69 (MIRV; ABM)

accuracy
of Position.

MX, dilation
continued, LOW
dread (1972-
(Scale?)

was as inappropriate, anachronistic
(O-L as long flexible), as SU reference to
Cuba-IT! Thus, 1964-69-70's - 87 ^{Dec-7,}

crucial misquid years on both sides

ICBM
H, 1952-54 [1956 - she saw, but didn't belt: DM
KRB]
Pre-DOT 1961-62 JFK " " " " " " " " " " " "
1963 - both JFK & K draft ball "

uprising (unlike G's plan) — was a
constant provocation to com. move!

(+ VCS/NATO plans to respond...)
(like America desire to hold down Berlin!)
(+ Russian desire to support Berlin)

1-14-12

SU imitation of an strat. power
after C-II

was not necessary or wise

(should have been "asymmetric,"
approp.)

If dicts and not credible
~~have~~ a "credible (reasonable)"
FS cap, ~~and~~ or FU troops
was an Polonia

If dicts and FU troops (being
goin up on Cuba - which it could
have kept, with two arms, or even SU
troops) - have dicts and
FS XDAI cap.

(it could match US FU in
Europe)

to see. would be too dangerous

and it could have - or even
credibly pretend to have (except to
P-100, CPD, David, USAF...) a cred.

FS cap - VS. POLARIS/Polaris/Polaris

who were willing to argue/war as if it
didn't exist!

1-14-12

If needed some good rules;
and perhaps necessarily some
limited measures (with or without
MIRV).

still true, initially!

~~the same~~

We should go down to 300
warheads initially (with R)

then engage all NWS in further
steep cuts.

No one should have 300 or
200 (or 100?!) warheads!

from
E level: 500 SLBMs

NO

or too much?

D.M.,

1-1¹⁹~~4~~-12

How little wisdom

Oxenstierna

Swedishness

Folsta

Huscha

Huschi

Catantrophe

Ernst

Wisdom?

- consider long-run

- expect reciprocation

rather "wise"

+ imitation

- concern for "others" - i.e. future child
+ environment

non-human life

(as if our welfare ~~as~~ security
was not independent of this,
or antithetical)

- others have - like us - brains, sense
of family & tribe/nation, desires,
... sometimes like ours in content,
some not

1-14-12

per Pilon on Betts

Vs. (?) Betts — 1. Our policy in CW (Betts? me, perhaps)
was not sound, appropri., compelling —
giving ^{not} SU.

2. It didn't just become excessive,
with serial end of CW

new: 1) Russ

2) Intervention

3. US real axis in TW, or 1st World,
were not really different from them now.
("liberal empire")

4. Yes, if SU had been what we (USAF, JCS,
RAND) supposed in 1950's — policies would have
been closer to being justified.

currently: greatest threat to US is

a) R Russ

b) Pak / Arabian axis (unless, Israeli / Iran)

c) US axis

d) terrorist axis

1-3-12

see Dyson: difference between "Super" (1949-50)
+ A-bomb (1951?)

Super: very expensive (titanium)
and very large in size, weight
+ (only) very large MT:

and

(ship
submarine)

(not precise
not plane
or missile
(Super))

but Piller-Ulam:

an ICBM:

(not, Super?)

for just KT: cheaper than A-bomb
smaller

+ small, cheap, large MT
purchase: CB

(just - no. 50 (long range:

> 100, 200 hundred
or mobile (only)

you can destroy any fixed targets
structure, facilities

and any number of the silo

and which kill vast number of people

But not, which, 3) found, before enough have

hatched for the to destroy your secret
(can enter fallen's shelter)
(Swiss?)

or get all mobile or sub mobile
Can about; MRSM;
COMs

1-4-72

Parlow: 270

R's "quite
great ~~to~~ build a
missile shield."

(But CF/prompter
- esp. without SDI/ABM
and

was + is as quite
as SDI!

(with avoid
dispute)

"Reduction" (can
large) can mean
strip (down)

"more efficient
pursuit of
D-L/CR/
Type 10 out,
RC...

(also "overkill,
duplication, redundancy
waste...

lots of "part"

not at all
movement toward
zero, etc.,

or in NEU...
stability...

(ASW was right -
these "numbers"
are not the same,
whether lower or
higher...)

Good

(McCrin -)

is $\approx$ US Signature
on Bnto. VI, NPT!

(It never meant
this - as did

BHO, McCrin '80,
(use HAK... Rum...)

Hand of abal
(McKin -)

is $\approx$ US signature
on Art. VI, NPT!

(It never meant
this - as did
BHO, McKin '80,
(see HAK... Rum...))

1-1-12 11:40pm

DM

Imagine the sort
of discussion and
debate that will
follow the next
unlabeled attack

(througout

Andrea - Park...

US/fo on them...)

2) How did we get here?

5)

(How apologists:
lies, cover-ups,
~~star~~ rationales, secrecy
shredding...

Imagine an investigator
(WG; ~~Chen~~ A; Pike
ICG; 9-11...)
Secrecy problem

Martin / Co. complaining
in denial, negligence
[see Katrina; only out the
10.10.10.10]

See review of
the 5 abolitionists
NPT BR 12-31-11

"What can we do?"

9-11

Blame?

Actual reactions

(Navel (Police
State))

Abol? Non-prolif?

or - one race

already: NO NORD

no. PROLIF (rather,

1) "3 m. Act. - (assess)

read TC 5

Write up book
as if a Kite
traveller had just
occurred

(China Syndrome
Three-mile Island
(Fukushima))

ASK, demand:

What are planned
purpos
for response to
next 9-11?

What ~~about~~
measures ~~AWAIT~~
another emergency?
(like 9-11
& anti Gulf)

Need: Naomi Klein
Shock Capitalism

next -

Scary
Rebel

call

his -
see

Norris, Kristensen,
Paine,

Steinbock

Ball

(SICOP Kristensen)

Burn

Bennett

Kuznetsov

(Delegation J:

Lagan

Alfon War

Blain

Granoff

Eden

POSTAL

JC 481-82

Russians welcome
animal is an
"opening to such
animals of other
nations," but a
stimulus and a response.

[4 D.M. ?]

US Policy → R posture
Pete knows NEU in
2000, after Kosovo bombing.

12-31-11

D.M.

Focus on

- Russian DM

- Probif

both promoted,
and protected from
~~any~~ attempts to
change

and bipartisan

of US DOJ (not just
US rules)

policy
US is greatest
danger to
anti-war course

- to US designs
- to non-prolif

JC 500 (hint)

JC 499

US determination to
^{create}
weird EU threat

(not just to reject NEU)

~~express~~ express threat in view of
SFR ability to retal (C-II -
retal large!) → and per

US insisting to
SL/R agreement

US mid. weak case
for FS/FU even in
C-II! + Berlin

"Always, presidents
best financial track records
to the back burner, but
they were never off
the stove."

("On the table —
all options")

from : (1920)

Center Doctrine
& Nuclear Crisis

(the 1959?
RAND group
1946)

20 years before
GWB; Afghan war,
too!

(Carter? after
his inaugural? & close)

SOYK - we still live with
prospects of war on US City.

Ernie Doyle
Pam was
cousins with
a dual

[not a threat
of V - or V]

No NNWS too
threatened was
(bluff) (without
being any)

Agitation yes

introduction of
difference

support
anxiety / obsessions

yes

(trauma pain !)

(C-II - Parity)

→ curvica yes

8 types:

one delegation
+ deep - Polity

5 types of threats:

- considering threats
can be: 1) bluffs

(but: preparations
warning/deception
(of subordinates))

2) half-bluffs: unreliable

3) "preemptive" (AMBIG)

party controlled by the
... to

(and threatened
convergence may be
unprecedented -
unknown territories
only.

(nines)
his war

the Bio. Boundary
(+ Has)
Oral History